

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 089 416

EA 006 003

AUTHOR DuVall, Charles R.
TITLE A Survey of School Board Policies and Administrative Procedures for Dealing with Supplementary Free Materials in Selected Smaller School Districts in the United States.
PUB DATE 3 May 74
NOTE 50p.; Paper presented at National Association of Industry-Education Cooperation Annual Meeting (Buffalo, New York, May 3, 1974); A related document is ED 056 381
EDRS PRICE MF-\$0.75 HC-\$3.15 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS Administrative Policy; *Administrator Role; *Board of Education Policy; Boards of Education; *Classroom Materials; Educational Research; Elementary Schools; Publications; Resource Materials; School Districts; *School Industry Relationship; Secondary Schools; Supplementary Reading Materials; Teacher Role
IDENTIFIERS *Supplementary Free Materials

ABSTRACT

This study specifically attempts to determine and compare (1) the existence of board policies, both written and unwritten, dealing with supplementary free materials; (2) the procedures and criteria used in selection and evaluation of these materials; and (3) the person(s) and/or group(s) responsible for determination of the acceptability and for distribution of these supplementary free materials. To obtain the data, superintendents in a random sample of smaller school districts were asked to respond to a questionnaire dealing with board policies on supplementary free materials. The data show that 29 percent of the respondents indicated the existence of a board policy dealing with supplementary free materials. Over 60 percent of the respondents indicated that their policy permitted the use of supplementary free materials by their instructional staff, while only one percent of the respondents indicated that their policy denied the use of these materials. Other findings, conclusions, and recommendations for further study are also presented. A substantial list of references is provided.
(Author/JF)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

A SURVEY OF SCHOOL BOARD POLICIES AND ADMINISTRATIVE
PROCEDURES FOR DEALING WITH SUPPLEMENTARY FREE
MATERIALS IN SELECTED SMALLER SCHOOL
DISTRICTS IN THE UNITED STATES

by

Charles R. DuVall, Ph.D.

Associate Professor of Education
Indiana University at South Bend

Prepared Under Faculty Research Grant

Number 26-651-19

Presented

Annual Meeting

National Association of Industry-Education Cooperation

Buffalo, New York

May 3, 1974

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
I. THE PROBLEM, PROCEDURES, AND DEFINITIONS OF TERMS USED	1
Background	1
Introduction	1
Importance of the study	2
Methods of Procedure and Sources of Data	3
Obtaining the population	3
Design of the questionnaire	3
Treatment of the data	4
Limitations of the Study	4
Definitions of Terms Used	5
II. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	6
School Board Policies	6
Administrative Procedures	8
Supplementary Free Materials	10
Summary of the Literature	11
III. PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA	13
Mailing and Receipt of Questionnaires	13
Analysis of Data	14
Additional Analyses	27
Summary	31
IV. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	32
Summary	32
Design of the study	32

CHAPTER

PAGE

Summary of the Findings	33
Conclusions	34
Recommendations for Further Study	35
REFERENCES	36
APPENDIX	39

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE		PAGE
1.	Responses to Questionnaires Classified by Size of Community	15
2.	Responses to Questionnaires Classified by Size of High School Graduating Class(es) .	16
3.	Responses Pertaining to Existence of Board Policy Concerning the Use of Supplementary Free Materials - Expressed as a Per Cent of Responses According to Community Size . .	17
4.	Responses Pertaining to Existence of Board Policy Concerning the Use of Supplementary Free Materials - Expressed as a Per Cent of Responses Within Size of High School Graduating Class	18
5.	Responses Pertaining to Existence of Written Board Policies Concerning the Use of Supplementary Free Materials - Expressed as a Per Cent of Responses According to Community Size	20
6.	Responses Pertaining to Existence of Written Board Policies Concerning the Use of Supplementary Free Materials - Expressed as a Per Cent of Responses Within Size of High School Graduating Class	21
7.	Responses Pertaining to Board Policy Dealing With Permission to Use Free Materials - Expressed as a Per Cent of Responses According to Community Size	22
8.	Responses Pertaining to Board Policy Dealing With Permission to Use Free Materials - Expressed as a Per Cent of Responses Within Size of High School Graduating Class . . .	23
9.	Persons or Groups Within School Districts Who Pass Upon the Acceptability of Supplementary Free Materials	25
10.	Criteria Used in Determination of Educational Acceptability of Supplementary Free Materials	26

TABLE

PAGE

11.	Persons or Groups Within School Districts Who Obtain and Distribute Supplementary Free Materials	28
-----	--	----

CHAPTER I
THE PROBLEM, PROCEDURES, AND
DEFINITIONS OF TERMS USED
BACKGROUND

Introduction. For over the past quarter of a century there has been a great quantity of free and inexpensive materials available to teachers for use with their classes. These supplementary teaching aids have taken the form of books, pamphlets, films, film strips, cut-outs and mobiles, and similar types of materials. They have been and continue to be provided free, or at a minimal cost, to teachers and school districts. They are provided by local, state, and national governmental agencies, industries, business, trade associations, and non-profit organizations.

An indication of the volume of the supplementary materials available to teachers is indicated by the number and type of catalogs which list these materials. Probably the most extensive and comprehensive catalog is the series of eight guides published by Educators Progress Service. This series is classified under the generic title of Educators Guides to Free Materials. The series lists free pamphlets, bulletins, film strips, movies, and tape recordings. Industry trade associations also publish catalogs which are of great value to teachers. One example of this type of catalog is that published by the American Iron and Steel Institute entitled Reference and Audio-Visual Materials on Iron and Steel.

Further, articles and monthly columns have appeared in trade magazines and publications informing teachers of the availability of the most recent supplementary free materials. A selected listing of these would include: "Keeping Up," in Teacher (formerly entitled "Teachers Service Bureau" in The Grade Teacher), and other listings in other professional journals almost too numerous to mention. Each of these columns has appeared monthly for several years. Several of these contain postal card coupons which are intended for use by teachers to indicate the desired materials. These materials are usually provided in classroom quantities. Magazine articles have appeared, and continue to appear, with a high degree of regularity citing sources where supplementary free materials may be obtained.

Additionally, there are specific pamphlet series which list sources of supplementary free materials that can be obtained in different areas of study. One example of this type of pamphlet series is the World Affairs Guides by Kenworthy. Another example is the excellent booklet entitled Yellow Pages of Learning Resources. As the title indicates, this booklet illustrates the way to use the yellow pages to locate community resources, which often include free printed materials.

Importance of the study. Educational administrators have long been interested in the formulation of school board policies and their implementation at the operational level. Today, schools are subjected to more and more pressures to bring

outside materials into the classroom. This study was intended, therefore, to add to the body of knowledge dealing with school board policies concerning the use of supplementary free materials, and the administrative procedures used to implement these policies. This study is a replication of previous studies (DuVall, 1972). The population of this study was what were termed "smaller" school districts.

METHODS OF PROCEDURE AND SOURCES OF DATA

The purposes of this section were to describe: (1) the methods used in obtaining the population; (2) the design of the questionnaire and (3) the statistical treatment of the data.

Obtaining the population. A random selection of school districts in areas with less than 100,000 population was made utilizing Patterson's American Education, 1972 Edition. A total of 1,000 districts was selected, without replacement.

Questionnaires, together with a covering letter, were mailed to the school superintendents of these selected school districts. A follow-up letter and questionnaire were mailed approximately one month later to those superintendents who had failed to respond to the initial request for information (See Appendix).

Design of the questionnaire. The initial questionnaire was designed with the assistance of Dr. Samuel I. Hicks, Director of the Ohio University Center for Educational Research and Service. The questionnaire used in this study was modified

in order to obtain the demographic data elicited by the first three questions.

The purpose of the questions asked was to elicit the following information: (1) to ascertain the existence of school board policies (written or unwritten) pertaining to supplementary free materials; (2) to determine the person(s) or group(s) who pass upon the acceptability of such materials and obtain them for the schools and school districts; (3) the criteria used for determining the acceptability of these materials; and (4) to obtain copies of written policies and administrative procedures used in implementing these policies in the individual school districts.

Treatment of the data. All data were analyzed and reported as a per cent of the total replies received to the questionnaire. Analyses were made of the number of replies received by population size of the respondent school districts as determined by the size of the high school graduating class, as well as other demographic data.

LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

The limitations of any investigation conducted by the use of normative survey techniques existed in this study. A further limitation resulted from the fact that the reliability of the data depended upon the accuracy with which the respondents (chief school administrators or their designated agent) responded to the instrument.

A further limitation may be the difficulty of differentiating between board policies and administrative procedures.

DEFINITIONS OF TERMS USED

Policies. A policy is a general statement of principle written in a clear, concise language, providing the school administrator guidelines within which to operate. A policy statement reflects careful and deliberate study and has an enduring quality. . . . (Prentice-Hall:6)

Procedures. A procedure is a method by which a policy is achieved and is the means through which a desired goal may be attained. A statement on procedure usually gives the steps for achieving the objective stated in the policy. . . . (Prentice-Hall:6)

Supplementary free materials. Materials available at no cost to the teacher or school system, or at a cost that only includes postage, from businesses and governmental agencies. These materials may be referred to by other terms, such as phantom, ephemeral, or vertical file materials.

Others. All other terms were defined as stated in Good's Dictionary of Education. (1973)

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

The literature surveyed in this study was divided into three parts. The first dealt with the formulation of school board policies, the second was the implementation of these policies through administrative procedures, and the third was concerned with a brief review of the magnitude of the use of supplementary free materials.

SCHOOL BOARD POLICIES

The power of a board of education to establish policies for the operation of schools is one of the rights and responsibilities vested in it by law. Greider, Pierce, and Rosenstengel wrote that in most states boards of education are granted great authority over school affairs in their districts. They note that one exception is the State of California where the Education Code is highly specific. These powers are not only specific legal requirements, but also cover a wide field of discretionary or implied powers. (115-17)

One of the ways in which a board of education may function most effectively is through the enactment of policy statements for the guidance and direction of both the board and school personnel. These policies, when enacted, are the result of a great deal of planning. (Ibid.: 114-15)

Knezevich observed that "Policies are more likely to fulfill their potentials if reduced to writing," yet he went

on to add that the development of a written policy statement was a relatively new phenomenon. Since the end of World War II studies have indicated that it was difficult to find a publication dealing with school boards which failed to make reference to the need for written school board policies. (224-25)

Moehlman compared written board policies to a yardstick by which all suggestions, recommendations, and procedures may be judged impersonally. He stated that many laymen and administrators tend to view written policies as constrictive and that they feel that they hamper action. His own views were that an enlightened minority of school administrators believe that a complete statement in printed form is an excellent device for clarifying policy, and that it further serves to objectively adjust differences between community, the schools, and the board of education. (145-46)

Further support of this position was that taken by Wynn in his book Organization of Public Schools. He stated that the primary function of all boards of education are legislative. The board, assisted by the superintendent and his staff, established policies and regulations to guide the schools. He believes that well-conceived policy statements insure consistency of action. They also tend to clarify the school system's philosophy by translating them into a "modus operandi." (25)

ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURES

The area of administrative procedures, which is referred to variously as the "implementation of board policies," or "rules and regulations," is not at all clearly defined. This lack of definition is not surprising to those engaged in educational administration.

Wynn, recognizing the differences which exist between policy and practice stated that they are sometimes hard to delineate. The execution of board policy must be delegated to the superintendent and his staff, while the policy-making function of the board must be protected also. There is, however, a strong possibility that these two functions may overlap, and at times may even conflict. It is here that policy must be redefined, and administrative practices and implementation be modified or changed. (25-26)

Both Knezevich (255-57) and Greider, Pierce and Rosenstengel (121-23) believe that it is the duty of the superintendent of schools to implement the policies of the board through administrative procedures which will enable the professional staff to function effectively within the framework established by board policies. Goldhammer, in The School Board, clearly supports this viewpoint. (52-55).

The American Association of School Administrators presented a list of classified examples in an attempt to "clarify the distinction between legislative or policy-forming functions and executive functions" in their yearbook School Boards in

Action. (48-51) This list was illustrative of many common examples of procedures and policies, but was not intended to be complete or all-inclusive.

Lawson also dealt with the establishment of administrative policy in some detail. He delineated his definitions by the use of the terms "over-all school policies" and "internal policies". He included the area of the selection of instructional materials under the classification of internal policies, without any reference to the involvement of the board of education in the matter. (362-64) This appeared to be contrary to the recommendations presented by many other authorities.

Mort and Ross discussed, the matter of administrative discretion in the application of board policies. They stated:

. . . Rules and procedures should be drafted wherever feasible in terms of the policies involved, leaving broad discretion to the administrators in their application.

The amount of discretion needed will vary from subject to subject. For most rules individual administrators should be empowered to make exceptions. . . .

Particularly is this needed in large school systems to forestall the tendency of principals to "pass the buck" to the central office, realizing that in only rare instances will the individual actually take the issue to the central office. (295)

Miller presented a model statement regarding "School Policy Statements on Controversial Issues" in a recent issue of The American Biology Teacher. His exemplar of an ideal policy statement included one point covering printed media. He believes that the choice of these materials should be left to the individual teacher. (481-83)

SUPPLEMENTARY FREE MATERIALS

The use of supplementary free materials in the classrooms of schools throughout the United States appeared to be a fairly common practice.

Sinclair, in his study A Report About Business-Sponsored Teaching Aids, reported that it was not possible to accurately summarize the extent of the use made of business-sponsored materials. He did, however, cite a range of requests among sources from as few as eight to as many as 13,667 per week. (46-47) This certainly is an indication of the impact that these materials have upon schools, if numbers of requests are used as a criterion measure.

Continuing this analysis further he reported that in 62 per cent of the schools surveyed the teacher concerned decided which free materials were to be used. Sinclair believed that more not fewer administrators and curriculum committees should be involved in this decision. (45)

The National Science Teachers Association, in their 1960 report entitled How Science Teachers Use Business-Sponsored Teaching Aids reported that 80 per cent of the respondents reported a favorable attitude on the part of school authorities toward the use of these materials. It is interesting to note that only one case of outright opposition to the use of the materials was reported among the 695 respondents. (29)

DuVall, in his 1973 study, reported similar findings. (34)

The American Association of School Administrators, in their booklet Choosing Free Materials for Use in the Schools, recommended that a school policy be established in order that the teacher might have proper guidelines in the selection of free materials. They cited such factors as the potential market represented by the captive audience of over 30 million children, and the obviously poor quality of some of the materials. (3-5; 11-15)

Hughes presented his views on the responsibility of the teacher to assess free materials carefully, with his title being the underlying thesis of his remarks - "Onus on the User." While he was examining the nature and use of free films his remarks are equally applicable to free printed materials. He basically cautions teachers to assess carefully all materials and use those that have direct applicability to the instructional program. (50)

Jenkins reported the results of his empirical investigation regarding the use of free materials as basic instructional tools. He reported "It appears that among non-science majors, successful use of industry-sponsored publications is associated significantly with academic ability as measured by ACT scores." (482)

SUMMARY OF THE LITERATURE

School boards should establish broad policies covering the operation of the schools. These policies should be

broad enough to give the school administrators who must operate under them operational latitude and flexibility. Written board policies have not been adopted by all boards of education, and in many cases where they have been written and adopted they have not been periodically revised.

The area of administrative procedures, which is interpreted as the implementation of board policies, is an area that is not at all clearly defined. In many cases it is difficult to determine what is policy and what is administrative procedure. However, it should be noted that in many cases this is not an important distinction. One area that should be given particular attention is the matter of administrative discretion in the application of board policies in administrative procedure.

School systems and individual teachers throughout the United States do seek out and use supplementary free materials. It has been recommended that school board policies be established to cover the acquisition and use of such materials, if such policies and procedures do not now exist.

CHAPTER III

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

The purposes of this chapter were to present the results of the analysis of the data of (1) the mailing and return of the questionnaire and (2) the data obtained from the answers to the questionnaire itself. In addition, selected questions were subjected to the chi-square test of independence.

MAILING AND RECEIPT OF QUESTIONNAIRES

The questionnaire was enclosed together with a covering letter (Appendix A) in an envelope addressed to the Superintendent of Schools of 1,000 randomly selected school districts in the United States in population centers of less than 100,000 persons. These letters were mailed April 1, 1973. Approximately two months later (June 12) a follow-up letter and questionnaire (Appendix A) were mailed to those superintendents of schools from whom no replies had been received by the date of the second mailing. Of the 1,000 questionnaires originally mailed 23 were returned by the postal service for selected reasons. Of the 977 questionnaires assumed to have been delivered (received by addressees) a total of 713 were returned. This resulted in a ratio of returns of 73 per cent as a result of the original and follow-up mailings. This ratio is considered to be sufficiently representative of the population sampled to permit generalization to the entire population.

The questionnaire was designed to elicit from the respondent an estimate of the size or type of school district from which data were requested. Respondents were asked to classify their districts by use of the terms rural, suburban, village, town, and city. Data relative to the number of responses in each category are presented in Table 1.

In addition, respondents were asked to classify their districts in a manner which would permit inferences being drawn concerning their relative size. It was determined that the size of their total high school graduating class(es) would provide a relative index from which comparisons could be made. An analysis of the responses received to this question is presented in Table 2.

ANALYSIS OF DATA

The superintendents of schools were queried concerning the existence of a policy which dealt with supplementary free materials. A total of 29 per cent of them responded that their school districts have such a policy. Seventy per cent of them replied that no such policy existed. Only one per cent of the respondents did not reply to this question. These data are presented in Tables 3 and 4. When asked about the existence of written board policy only eight per cent of the superintendents indicated that their districts had such written policies. A total of 36 per cent of the superintendents failed to respond to this question, presumably

TABLE 1. RESPONSES TO QUESTIONNAIRES CLASSIFIED BY SIZE
OF COMMUNITY

Classification	f	Per Cent of Total
Rural	171	24
Suburban	80	11
Village (under 10,000)	161	23
Town (10,000 - 50,000)	206	29
City (50,00+)	87	12
No response	8	1
Total	713	100

TABLE 2. RESPONSES TO QUESTIONNAIRES CLASSIFIED BY SIZE
OF HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATING CLASS(ES)

Range of Size of Graduating Class	f	Per Cent of Total
1 - 25	31	4
26 - 50	64	9
51 - 100	99	14
101 - 200	128	18
201 - 300	91	13
301 - 400	75	11
401 - 500	53	7
501+	158	22
No response	14	2
Total	713	100

TABLE 3. RESPONSES PERTAINING TO EXISTENCE OF BOARD POLICY
CONCERNING THE USE OF SUPPLEMENTARY FREE MATERIALS -
EXPRESSED AS A PER CENT OF RESPONSES ACCORDING TO COMMUNITY
SIZE

Response	Rural	Sub'r	Vil'g	Town	City	Total
Policy exists	18	39	26	34	42	29
No policy	82	60	74	66	56	70
No response	0	1	0	0	2	1
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100

Question: Does your school system have a policy pertaining
to the selection of supplementary free materials
for classroom use by teachers?

TABLE 4. RESPONSES PERTAINING TO EXISTENCE OF BOARD POLICY
CONCERNING THE USE OF SUPPLEMENTARY FREE MATERIALS -
EXPRESSED AS A PER CENT OF RESPONSES WITHIN SIZE OF
HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATING CLASS

Responses	1 25	26 50	51 100	101 200	201 300	301 400	401 500	501+	Total
Policy exists	16	20	24	19	24	37	38	44	29
No policy	84	80	76	81	75	61	62	55	70
No response	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	1	1
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Question: Does your school system have a policy pertaining to the selection of supplementary free materials for classroom use by teachers?									

because of the distinct possibility that this question was confusing to the respondents, particularly those who answered negatively in the first instance. These data are presented in Tables 5 and 6.

An examination of the data contained in Table 3 revealed that policies relating to the use of supplementary free materials exist to some degree in all categories of districts but that the suburban and city districts tend to have more such policies than do districts in less populous areas. When written policies were considered (Table 5) the same distribution of the data prevailed, but with smaller numbers indicating that their policies were written.

A comparison of the data contained in Tables 4 and 6, in which responses were categorized in relation to the size of the high school graduating class (from which the relative size of the school district can be inferred), showed that policies existed primarily in the larger districts. It was also apparent that the larger districts tended to have such policies in written form, even though written policies are the exception rather than the rule.

Examination of the data presented in Tables 7 and 8 revealed that 65 per cent of the respondents indicated that their school policy permitted the use of supplementary free materials by their teaching staffs. This, when contrasted with the data contained in Tables 3, 4, 5, and 6 led to the conclusion that more school districts permit the use of

TABLE 5. RESPONSES PERTAINING TO EXISTENCE OF WRITTEN BOARD POLICIES CONCERNING THE USE OF SUPPLEMENTARY FREE MATERIALS - EXPRESSED AS A PER CENT OF RESPONSES ACCORDING TO COMMUNITY SIZE

Response	Rural	Sub'r	Vil'g	Town	City	Total
Policy is written	2	15	3	11	17	8
Unwritten policy or no policy	55	50	59	55	61	56
No response	43	35	38	34	22	36
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100

Question: Does your school system have a policy pertaining to the selection of supplementary free materials for classroom use by teachers?

Is this policy written?

TABLE 6. RESPONSES PERTAINING TO EXISTENCE OF WRITTEN BOARD POLICIES CONCERNING THE USE OF SUPPLEMENTARY FREE MATERIALS - EXPRESSED AS A PER CENT OF RESPONSES WITHIN SIZE OF HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATING CLASS

Response	1 25	26 50	51 100	101 200	201 300	301 400	401 500	501+	Total
Policy is written	3	5	2	1	4	7	17	21	8
Unwritten policy or no policy	52	61	58	51	55	68	45	56	56
No response	45	34	40	48	41	25	38	23	36
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

Question: Does your school system have a policy pertaining to the selection of supplementary free materials for classroom use by teachers?

Is this policy written?

TABLE 7. RESPONSES PERTAINING TO BOARD POLICY DEALING WITH
 PERMISSION TO USE FREE MATERIALS - EXPRESSED AS A PER CENT
 OF RESPONSES ACCORDING TO COMMUNITY SIZE

Response	Rural	Sub'r	Vill'g	Town	City	Total
Use permitted	61	68	65	67	71	65
Use denied	1	1	0	0	2	1
No response	38	31	35	33	28	34
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100

Question: Does your policy permit the use of such free
 materials by teachers with their classes?

TABLE 8. RESPONSES PERTAINING TO BOARD POLICY DEALING WITH
 PERMISSION TO USE FREE MATERIALS - EXPRESSED AS A PER CENT
 OF RESPONSES WITHIN SIZE OF HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATING CLASS

Response	1 25	26 50	51 100	101 200	201 300	301 400	401 500	501+	Total
Use permitted	71	67	64	56	63	71	68	73	65
Use denied	0	2	0	2	1	0	2	1	1
No response	29	31	36	42	36	29	30	26	34
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Question: Does your policy permit the use of such free materials by teachers with their classes?									

supplementary free materials than have a policy, either written or unwritten, dealing with the subject. These data would tend to support the belief that more superintendents are aware of the existence and use of supplementary free materials than have any policy regulating its use in the schools.

Particularly noteworthy was the fact that 34 per cent of the superintendents failed to respond to this question. Only one per cent of those who responded indicated that the use of supplementary free materials was denied their teaching staffs.

The individual teacher was cited most often as the person responsible for passing upon the acceptability of supplementary free materials. Teachers were identified as making the decision in 77 per cent of the responses. The building principal was identified as having a role in this decision in 66 per cent of the questionnaires returned to this survey. A sharp dropoff in the response pattern was noted when other members of the school staff were included in the decision relating to the acceptability of supplementary free materials. These data are presented in Table 9.

Data related to the criteria used in the determination of educational acceptability of supplementary free materials are presented in Table 10. The two most frequently identified criteria were "appropriate to curricular objectives" (75 per cent), and "educational value apparent" (59 per cent).

TABLE 9. PERSONS OR GROUPS WITHIN SCHOOL DISTRICTS WHO
PASS UPON THE ACCEPTABILITY OF SUPPLEMENTARY FREE MATERIALS

Individual or Group	f	Per Cent of Total
Individual Teacher	549	77
Building Principal	469	66
Building Librarians	208	29
Curriculum Supervisor(s)	156	22
Asst. Supt./Instruction	132	19
Superintendent of Schools	115	16
Building Curriculum Comm.	50	7
System-wide Curriculum Comm.	45	6
Other	39	5

Note: Multiple responses were received in many cases.
Totals exceed 100 per cent.

Question: Which person(s) or group(s) pass upon the accept-
ability of supplementary free materials?

Individual Teacher
Building Principal
Building Librarians
Building Curriculum Committee
Curriculum Supervisor(s)
System-wide Curriculum Committee
Assistant Superintendent for Instruction
Superintendent of Schools
Other (please specify)

TABLE 10. CRITERIA USED IN THE DETERMINATION OF EDUCATIONAL ACCEPTABILITY OF SUPPLEMENTARY FREE MATERIALS

Criteria	f	Per Cent of Total
Appropriate to curricular objectives	532	75
Educational value apparent	421	59
Free of objectionable advertising	343	48
Supplementary to existing materials	309	43
Criteria decision left to teachers	204	29
Free from bias	188	26
Attractiveness	71	10
Non-controversial	70	10
No restrictions on use imposed	57	8
Other	0	0

Note: Multiple responses were received in many cases.
Totals exceed 100 per cent.

Question: What are the criteria used for determining the educational acceptability of supplementary free materials for classroom use?

Appropriate to curricular objectives
Free of objectionable advertising
Educational value apparent
Criteria decision left to teachers
Free from bias
Attractiveness
Supplementary to existing materials
Non-controversial
No restrictions on use imposed
Other (please specify)

Somewhat less frequently mentioned criteria were "free of objectionable advertising" (48 per cent), and "supplementary to existing materials" (43 per cent). All of the criteria listed on the instrument were selected with a frequency which should recommend them for consideration in determining the acceptability of supplementary free materials.

Another area of interest is that dealing with those persons or groups who obtain and distribute supplementary free materials. It was found that the major responsibility for this function remained within the school building. The most frequently mentioned individual was the teacher, followed by the building principal and the librarian. These data are presented in Table 11.

ADDITIONAL ANALYSES

In addition to the analyses of the data previously presented it was determined to subject selected factors to additional statistical analysis. For this purpose the chi-square test for independence was used.

Contingency tables were constructed and the "independence value" for each cell of the table was calculated, and from this the chi-square value was computed. The program for the Monroe 1265 Computer was used in all computations.

The first contingency table constructed contained the data related to community size (question 1) and the persons or groups passing upon the acceptability of supplementary

TABLE 11. PERSONS OR GROUPS WITHIN SCHOOL DISTRICTS WHO
OBTAIN AND DISTRIBUTE SUPPLEMENTARY FREE MATERIALS

Individual or Group	f	Per Cent of Total
Individual Teacher	553	78
Building Principal	515	72
Building Librarians	352	49
Curriculum Supervisor(s)	201	28
Superintendent of Schools	185	26
Asst. Supt./Instruction	165	23
Building Curriculum Comm.	105	15
System-wide Curriculum Comm.	78	11
Other	24	3

Note: Multiple responses were received in many cases.
Totals exceed 100 per cent

Question: Supplementary free materials can be obtained
and distributed by:

Individual Teacher
Building Principal
Building Librarians
Building Curriculum Committee
Curriculum Supervisor(s)
System-wide Curriculum Committee
Assistant Superintendent for Instruction
Superintendent of Schools
Other (please specify)

free materials. In this analysis, as well as all of the others presented in this section, the non-response category was not included. A chi-square value of 134.371 was computed with 32 degrees of freedom. This value is significant at $P > .001$. Therefore, there is a statistically significant relationship between size of the community and the level at which the acceptability of supplementary free materials is determined.

The next analysis conducted, in which the size of the high school graduating class (question 3) was used as a variable, revealed that a chi-square value of 180.392 was obtained with 56 degrees of freedom. This value is significant at $P > .001$. Again, it can be stated that there is a relationship between the size of the school district (as inferred from the size of the high school graduating class) and the level at which the acceptability of supplementary free materials is determined.

A second set of data were analyzed using the variables of community size (question 1) and the size of the high school graduating class (question 3). These data were tested for independence against the criteria for the determination of the acceptability of supplementary free materials (question 9). In the first analysis of community size and acceptability a chi-square value of 48.854 was obtained with 32 degrees of freedom. The hypothesis of independence was retained with a P between .05 and .02. When the size of the school district

(as inferred from the size of the high school graduating class) was compared with the criteria of acceptability, a chi-square value of 56.445 was obtained with 56 degrees of freedom. The hypothesis of independence (unrelatedness) was retained with a P between .50 and .30.

A third analysis was conducted, in which the variables of community size (question 1) and the size of the school district (high school graduating class size, question 3) were tested for independence against the individuals identified as being responsible for obtaining and distributing these materials in the schools. A chi-square value of 152.828 was obtained with 32 degrees of freedom. This value is significant at $P > .001$.

The analysis of data comparing the (inferred) school district size with those individuals responsible for obtaining and distributing supplementary free materials resulted in a chi-square value of 164.567 with 56 degrees of freedom. This value was significant at $P > .001$.

In summary, the results of the statistical analyses revealed that there was a relationship between the individuals involved in the making of decisions related to the acceptability of supplementary free materials and the size of the community and the size of the school district. Inspection of the data revealed that the larger the school district the more removed from the classroom the decision making process became, yet the classroom teacher and building principal were still the two key persons involved.

When the criteria of acceptability were analyzed there was a trend toward differentiation based upon community size, yet this was less than that observed and tested with the other factors.

Finally, the analysis revealed that there is a statistical relationship between the size of the community and school district and those persons and/or groups who obtain and distribute supplementary free materials.

SUMMARY

This chapter has presented the findings which were derived from the analysis of the data.

Within the population of school districts sampled policies relating to the use of supplementary free materials generally do not exist in either written or unwritten form. Procedures do exist within school districts which permit the use of these materials. The existence of procedures is inferred from the responses which indicated the unwritten existence of criteria. Respondents also indicated the recognition of persons within the school districts who were charged with the responsibility of obtaining and distributing materials, as well as passing upon their curricular acceptability.

CHAPTER IV

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The purposes of this chapter were to present: (1) a summary of the problem and the procedures used; (2) a summary of the findings; (3) the major conclusions; and (4) recommendations for further study.

SUMMARY

Review of the problem. It was the purpose of this study to investigate the school board and/or administrative policies concerning, and administrative procedures for dealing with, supplementary free materials in selected smaller school districts of the United States.

These studies specifically attempted to determine, and compare where applicable: (1) the existence of board policies, both written and unwritten, which dealt with supplementary free materials; (2) the procedures and criteria used in the selection and evaluation of these materials; and (3) the person(s) and/or group(s) responsible for the determination of the acceptability and the distribution of these supplementary free materials. This study was intended to add to the body of knowledge concerned with board policies and administrative procedures used in dealing with supplementary free materials.

Design of the study. Data for this study were collected as follows:

1. A random sample of smaller school districts was listed and the superintendent of the school system in these districts was contacted, using a questionnaire designed to elicit responses dealing with board policies in their respective school systems relating to supplementary free materials.

2. The data from the analysis of these questionnaires were tabulated and reported as: (1) the per cent of responses to the questionnaires received by population size of the school district; (2) the existence of board policies dealing with supplementary free materials; (3) the person(s) and/or group(s) responsible for the determination of the acceptability and distribution of these materials; and (4) the criteria used for determining the acceptability of these materials by the school districts. In addition, statistical analyses of selected factors were conducted, utilizing the chi-square test of independence.

SUMMARY OF THE FINDINGS

1. The data showed that 29 per cent of the respondents indicated the existence of a board policy dealing with supplementary free materials.

2. Over 60 per cent of the respondents indicated that their policy permitted the use of supplementary free materials by their instructional staff. Only one per cent of the respondents indicated that their policy denied the use of these materials.

3. The individual teacher and building principal were the persons most often designated as being responsible for determining the acceptability of supplementary free materials.

4. In the identification of criteria for the determination of acceptability of supplementary free materials the two most frequently cited criteria were that the materials must be appropriate to the curricular objectives and the educational value of these materials must be apparent.

5. The teacher and building principal were the two most frequently identified individuals having responsibility for obtaining and distributing supplementary free materials.

CONCLUSIONS

Four basic conclusions were drawn from the findings of this study:

1. On the basis of the replies received to the questionnaire, the use of supplementary free materials was permitted in the school districts surveyed.

2. Policies regarding supplementary free materials exist in one-third of the school districts which responded to the questionnaire. Less than one-tenth of the policies in the respondent's districts are written.

3. The individual teacher and the building principal play a major role in determining the acceptability of supplementary free materials. The role of the central office, when it exists, will be most frequently represented through the use of supervisory personnel.

4. There are many diverse criteria which are used in the determination of acceptability of supplementary free materials. Two criteria were identified with greater frequency than any others. These were: (1) that the materials should be relevant to the instructional program; and (2) be educationally significant.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER STUDY

The findings, conclusions, and a review of the many aspects of the study indicated that the following recommendations for further study should be considered.

1. That a replication of this study be considered in five years.
2. There is a great need in the area of teacher utilization of supplementary free materials. Investigation in this area appears to be warranted in view of the fact that many considerations undoubtedly influence teachers in their use of these materials. While not all of these factors could be investigated simultaneously, it appears that a beginning should be made in an attempt to isolate pertinent variables.
3. Investigation should be made concerning the involvement of teachers in the production and evaluation of these materials.

REFERENCES

American Association of School Administrators, Choosing Free Materials for Use in the Schools, Washington: American Association of School Administrators of the National Education Association, 1955.

American Association of School Administrators, School Boards in Action, Twenty-fourth Yearbook of the American Association of School Administrators, Washington: American Association of School Administrators of the National Education Association, 1946.

DuVall, Charles R., "A Comparative Study of School Board Policies and Administrative Procedures for 1965 and 1970 for Dealing with Supplementary Free Materials in School Districts in Cities with Populations over 100,000 in the United States," Research in Education, 7:23, March, 1972, (ERIC Document No. ED 056 381).

"A Study of Teacher Opinion Concerning Selected Free Filmstrips Provided by the American Iron and Steel Institute to Schools Throughout the United States," Research in Education, 8:97, June, 1973, (ERIC Document No. ED 072 992).

"A Study of Teacher Opinions and Evaluations Concerning Selected Free Printed Materials Provided by the American Iron and Steel Institute to Individuals Throughout the United States," Research in Education, 9:164, February, 1974, (ERIC Document No. ED 083 084).

and Wayne J. Krepel, "Use and Misuse of Industry-Sponsored Materials," mimeographed paper presented to the 22nd Annual Meeting of the National Science Teachers Association, N.A.I.E.C. Session, Chicago: March 16, 1974, (Submitted to ERIC ChESS Clearinghouse for publication in Research in Education).

Educators Guides to Free Materials, editors vary, (revised annually), Randolph, Wisconsin: Educators Progress Service, 1957-1974.

Goldhammer, Keith, The School Board, The Library of Education Series, New York: The Center for Applied Research in Education, Inc., 1964.

Good, Carter V., (ed.), Dictionary of Education, Third edition, New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1973.

Greider, Calvin, Truman M. Pierce, and William Everett Rosenstengel, Public School Administration, New York: The Ronald Press Company, 1961.

Hughes, Alec, "Onus on the User," The Times Educational Supplement, 3033:50, July 13, 1973.

Jerkins, Kenneth F., "Use and Evaluation of Selected Industry-Sponsored Publications in Teaching Contemporary Biology," Science Education, 55:477-82, October, 1971.

"Keeping Up," Teacher, monthly column (formerly entitled "Teachers Service Bureau," in The Grade Teacher, both the publication and the column had title changes).

Kenworthy, Leonard S., World Affairs Guides, New York: Bureau of Publications, Columbia University, Teachers College, 1962, 1963.

Knezevich, Stephen J., Administration of Public Education, New York: Harper and Brothers, 1962.

Lawson, Douglas E., School Administration: Procedures and Practices, New York: The Odyssey Press, 1953.

Miller, Harry G., "School Policy Statements on Controversial Issues," American Biology Teacher, 35:481-83, November, 1973.

Moehlman, Arthur B., School Administration, Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1951.

Mort, Paul R. and Donald H. Ross, Principles of School Administration, Second edition, New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1957.

National Science Teachers Association, How Science Teachers Use Business-Sponsored Teaching Aids, Washington: Advisory Council on Industry-Science Teaching Relations of the National Science Teachers Association of the National Education Association, 1950.

Patterson's American Education, 1972, (Volume LXVIII), Mt. Prospect, Illinois: Educational Directories, Inc., 1971.

Prentice-Hall Editorial Staff, School Executives Guide, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1964.

Reference and Audio-Visual Materials on Iron and Steel,
Washington: American Iron and Steel Institute, 1973.

Sinclair, Thomas J., Business-Sponsored Teaching Aids,
Dansville, New York: F. A. Owen Publishing Company,
1949.

Wynn, D. Richard, Organization of Public Schools, The
Library of Education Series, New York: The Center
for Applied Research in Education, Inc., 1964.

Yellow Pages of Learning Resources, Cambridge, Mass.: The
MIT Press, 1972.

APPENDIX

INDIANA UNIVERSITY at SOUTH BEND

1825 NORTHSIDE BOULEVARD
SOUTH BEND, INDIANA 46615

40

SCHOOL OF EDUCATION

April 1, 1973

TEL. NO. 219 342-2341

Dear Superintendent:

I am conducting a survey of a sample of school districts throughout the United States to determine their school board policies regarding teacher use of supplementary free materials (free and inexpensive materials).

It is hoped that this study will contribute to the body of knowledge regarding current policies and practices for dealing with this educational tool. Your participation in this study is requested. Your school district will not be identified by name in the study, only an analysis of the responses and materials provided will be made.

If you want a summary of the results of this study please complete the enclosed mailing label and return it with your questionnaire. You will receive the summary when the study is completed.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,



Charles R. DuVall
Associate Professor
of Education

_____ (for office use only)

QUESTIONNAIRE

Please answer the following questions about your school district. Check the appropriate response(s) where applicable.

1. Size of community which your school district serves:

_____ Rural	_____ Town (10-50,000)
_____ Suburban	_____ City (50,000+)
_____ Village (under 10,000)	

2. Which one of the following best describes your school district?

_____ A district with a majority of students drawn from a low socio-economic background.
_____ A district with students drawn mainly from farming and/or ranching background.
_____ A district with a majority of students drawn from a suburban background (i.e. living outside a city or town but not being of an agricultural background).
_____ An "average" district where no one type of background predominates.
_____ Other (please comment): _____

3. What is the total size of your high school(s) graduating class for this school year (June, 1973)?

_____ 1 - 25	_____ 201 - 300
_____ 26 - 50	_____ 301 - 400
_____ 51 - 100	_____ 401 - 500
_____ 101 - 200	_____ 501+

Definition: Free and Inexpensive Materials, materials available at no cost to the teacher, or at a cost that only includes postage. These materials can be obtained from either community, business, or government agencies. Also called Supplementary Free Materials.

POLICY:

Does your school system have a policy pertaining to the selection of supplementary free materials for classroom use by teachers?

___ Yes ___ No

Is this policy written?

___ Yes ___ No

If answer to above is "yes" please enclose a copy of this written policy with your reply, if readily available.

Does your policy permit the use of such free materials by teachers with their classes?

___ Yes ___ No

PROCEDURES:

Which person(s) or group(s) pass upon the acceptability of supplementary free materials?

- ___ Individual teacher
- ___ Building Principal
- ___ Building Librarians
- ___ Building Curriculum Committee
- ___ Curriculum Supervisor(s)
- ___ System-wide Curriculum Committee
- ___ Assistant Superintendent for Instruction
- ___ Superintendent of Schools
- ___ Other (please specify) _____

Please TURN PAGE to complete this survey.

What are the criteria used for determining the educational acceptability of supplementary free materials for classroom use?

- ___ Appropriate to curricular objectives
- ___ Free of objectionable advertising
- ___ Educational value apparent
- ___ Criteria decision left to teachers
- ___ Free from bias
- ___ Attractiveness
- ___ Supplementary to existing materials
- ___ Non-controversial
- ___ No restrictions on use imposed
- ___ Other (please specify) _____

Supplementary free materials can be obtained and distributed by:

- ___ Individual teacher
- ___ Building Principal
- ___ Building Librarians
- ___ Building Curriculum Committee
- ___ Curriculum Supervisor(s)
- ___ System-wide Curriculum Committee
- ___ Assistant Superintendent for Instruction
- ___ Superintendent of Schools
- ___ Other (please specify) _____

Please use this space for any additional comments or remarks you care to make concerning free and inexpensive materials:

.....

NOTE: If you would like a summary of this study please complete the enclosed mailing label and return it with this questionnaire to:

Charles R. DuVall
Indiana University at South Bend
1825 Northside Boulevard
South Bend, Indiana 46615

INDIANA UNIVERSITY at SOUTH BEND

1825 NORTHSIDE BOULEVARD
SOUTH BEND, INDIANA 46615

45

April 1, 1973

TEL. NO. 239 287-2341

Dear Superintendent:

I am conducting a survey of a sample of school districts throughout the United States to determine their school board policies regarding teacher use of supplementary free materials (free and inexpensive materials).

It is hoped that this study will contribute to the body of knowledge regarding current policies and practices for dealing with this educational tool. Your participation in this study is requested. Your school district will not be identified by name in the study, only an analysis of the responses and materials provided will be made.

If you want a summary of the results of this study please complete the enclosed mailing label and return it with your questionnaire. You will receive the summary when the study is completed.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,



Charles R. DuVall
Associate Professor
of Education

*request
renewably
you. I hope you
be able to cooperate
with me. Additional
materials enclosed.
Thanks,
CRD
6-12-73*